



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HARVARD STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY. Edited by a Committee of the Classical Instructors of Harvard University. Vol. I, 1890. Boston, Ginn & Company.

A prefatory note states that "these studies are published by authority of Harvard University, and will be contributed chiefly by its instructors and graduates, although contributions from other sources will not necessarily be excluded. The publication is supported by a fund of \$6000, generously subscribed by the class of 1856. A volume of about 200 pages will be issued yearly."

Vol. I contains the following articles: The Fauces of the Roman House, J. B. Greenough (cut). Opinions of previous writers concerning the position of the fauces are mentioned, after which Vitruvius, VI 1-4, is discussed in connection with the use of the word fauces by other authors. The result of the investigation is to show that the fauces were the entrance to the atrium. The same conclusion was reached by Ivanhoff, *Annali dell' Istituto*, 1859, p. 82, and adopted by von Rohden, *Baumeister, Denkmäler*, p. 1366.

De Ignis Eliciendi Modis apud Antiquos, M. H. Morgan. This article was written for the purpose of obtaining the degree of Ph. D. The ancients kindled fires from fires already burning whenever that was possible. When a new fire had to be started various means were employed. The most primitive method is by rubbing two sticks together, but this was early superseded by the practice of twirling a stick (*πυρρεῖον*, ignitabulum, igniarium) in a hole made in a board or other piece of wood. This could be twirled by rubbing it alternately with the hands or by twisting a cord about it and pulling the ends of the cord alternately. The latter method makes two persons necessary. To obviate this difficulty the ends of the string were fastened to the ends of a bow-shaped stick, which could be moved back and forth with one hand, thus pulling the ends of the cord alternately. This instrument was the *ἀρίς*. The word *στορεῖς* in Hesych. and the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius is a mistake for *τορεῖς*, which is equivalent to *τρίπανον* or *πυρρεῖον*. The best material for the *πυρρεῖον* was the laurel or a wild vine, for the wood in which the *πυρρεῖον* was turned (*ἑσχάρα*, tabula) the ivy. The first mention of a spark struck from two stones is found in Soph. Phil. 295. This method remained in use longer than any other. The stones best fitted for this purpose were flint and pyrites, a copper ore. The use of iron for striking a spark from stone is first mentioned by Lucretius, 6, 162, and seems not to have been common. The spark was caught in sulphur, dry fungi, leaves or shavings. The reed (*νάρθηξ*, ferula) was used, not as fuel, but for the purpose of covering and preserving live coals. The use of glass to kindle fire by the rays of the sun is mentioned by Aristophanes (Nub. 764 sqq.), but was evidently unusual in his time. The shape recommended by Pliny is that of a ball. Crystal was not known in early times, but Pliny mentions the use of a crystal ball in cautery, and later writers also speak of its use as a burning-glass. Fire was also kindled by reflection of the sun's rays from a concave mirror. This method is mentioned by Euclid, Plutarch and Pliny. The mirrors were of metal, not glass. A combination of plane mirrors can be made to cause fire, but the story that Archimedes set fire to the ships of Marcellus by such means is rejected as false. The story may be founded upon experiments which Archimedes may have recorded. On the

first of March of every year the vestal virgins kindled anew the sacred fire. This they did by friction. The passage in Plutarch, v. Num. IX, which seems to contradict this statement, refers to Greek, not to Roman matters, and is interpolated besides. Julian, Orat. ad Solem regem, p. 155 A, refers probably to Byzantine affairs. The instrument mentioned in the rejected passage in Plutarch, by which the sun's rays kindled a fire, was a prism or cube from which part of the upper surface was cut out in a parabolic curve so as to concentrate the sun's rays by reflection.

On the Origin of the Construction of *οὐ μή* with the Subjunctive and the Future Indicative, W. W. Goodwin. The independent subjunctive with *μή* was used as "an expression of apprehension with desire to avert its object . . . The aorist subjunctive is the most common form here, the present being less frequent." The subjunctive with *οὐ μή* is the negative of the subjunctive with *μή*. "This form of future denial next admitted the future indicative in the same sense as the subjunctive. The second person singular of this future with *οὐ μή* was used by the dramatists as a prohibition, without abandoning the sense which the future can always have in both positive and negative commands. In these prohibitions the future indicative, in which they had their origin, is generally used; but the subjunctive occasionally occurs, being analogous to the ordinary aorist subjunctive with *μή* in prohibitions."

On some Disputed Points in the Construction of *ἔδει*, *χρῆν*, etc., with the Infinitive, W. W. Goodwin. It is generally laid down as an absolute rule that when *ἔδει* (*χρῆν*, etc.) is used without *ἄν* with the infinitive, the opposite of the infinitive is always implied, and that when *ἄν* is used, the opposite of the verbs of necessity (obligation, etc.) is implied, e. g. that with *ἔδει τοῦτο γίνεσθαι* we must understand *ἀλλ' οὐ γίγνεται*, with *ἔδει ἄν τοῦτο γίνεσθαι* we must understand *ἀλλ' οὐ δεῖ*. This does not cover all cases, e. g. Hdt. I 39 *εἰ ὑπὸ δόδοντος εἶπε τελευτήσῃν με, χρῆν δὴ σε ποιεῖν τὰ ποιεῖς*, and concessive sentences, in which the statement precludes the contrary of the apodosis, as Hdt. VII 56, Isoc. XVIII 19. In some concessive sentences the action of the infinitive is denied, notwithstanding the concessive protasis, e. g. Soph. O. T. 255, Thuc. I 38. The following rules cover all cases: 1. "The form without *ἄν* is used when the infinitive is the principal word, on which the chief force of the expression falls, while the leading verb is an auxiliary which we can express by *ought*, *might*, *could*, or by an adverb. 2. On the other hand, when the chief force falls on the necessity, propriety, or possibility of the act, and not on the act itself, the leading verb has *ἄν*, like any other imperfect in a similar apodosis." In all examples of *ἔδει ἄν* "we find *ἔδει ἄν* in its meaning *there would be* (or *would have been*) *need*, whereas in the form without *ἄν* we generally have *ἔδει* in the sense of *ought*, expressing *obligation* and not *necessity*." *ἔδει ἄν* differs from *ἔδει* without *ἄν* in meaning as well as in balance of emphasis. *ἔξῃν ἄν* differs from *ἔξῃν* only in the latter respect. In opposition to La Roche, the integrity of two passages (Dem. XVIII 195, Lys. XII 32) in which *χρῆν ἄν* occurs is maintained. In the use of *licebat*, *debebat*, etc. (= *ἔξῃν*, *χρῆν*, etc.), and *liceret*, *deberet* (= *ἔξῃν ἄν*, *χρῆν ἄν*), the Latin follows the same principle as the Greek. But when these expressions refer to past time, the Latin uses *debuisset* or *debuisset* in the sense of *χρῆν*, *debuisset* in that of *χρῆν ἄν*.

Notes on Quintilian, G. M. Lane. The original long quantity of the *o* of

the genitive plural ending *-om* is shown (1) by the dropping of the final *m* on coins struck before the Punic war; (2) by the apex occurring in the inscription of Nuceria, IRN.2096; CIL. X, n. 1081: DVVMVIRATVS, which proves the length of the *u* in this genitive. Quintilian, I 6, 18, mistakes the genitives plural *nummum* and *deum* for misused accusatives singular, showing that in his day the long *ō* or *ū* was forgotten. Quintilian, I 4, 27, gives *lectum* as a word which may be a participium or an appellatio. But *lēctum*, 'bed,' has a short *ē*, while *lēctum*, 'picked,' has a long *ē*. Read, therefore, *lectum*. The passage I 4, 16, which the last editors, Halm and Meister, read thus: quid o atque u permūtata inuicem? ut 'Hecoba' et '†notrix,' 'Culcides' et 'Pulixena' scriberentur, is emended by reading 'nutrix Culcidis.' The nurse of Medea is well known.

Some Latin Etymologies, J. B. Greenough. The words *reciprocus*, *proximus*, *procus* (in the sense of *foremost man*), *proceres*, *procax*, *Proculus*, *procul*, are all derived from †*procus* = *pro* + *cus*. Of these, *reciprocus* is a compound of †*recus* and †*procus*, meaning *back and forth*. From †*recus* come also *recipero* and *recens*. The fundamental meaning of *improbis* has not been clearly understood. *Probus* is *pro* + *bus*, the use of *pro* being analogous to that of *super* in *superbus*. *Probus* appears to have been a mercantile word, meaning *A1* or *first-class*. Then *improbis* means *not first-class, second rate*, etc. *Rudimentum* is derived from *rudis*, *foil* or *stick*, through a real or supposed verb *rudio*, *fence with the foil*. *Rudimentum* is then *foil-practice*, the first practice of the soldier, hence first attempts generally. From *rudis* an adjective *erudis* would mean *out of the foil*, and from this *erudio* naturally means *train to the point of graduation* from mere foil-practice. *Desidero* is derived from an adjective †*desides* (or *desider*). The original meaning of *sidus* was probably *place*. Then †*desider* or the phrase *de sidere* would mean *out of place*, and *desidero* would mean *mark or find out of place* after a battle or military casualty. This military sense of the word is common. *Considero* may have had a similar origin from an adjective †*consides* (or *-er*). *Elementum* is derived from LMN, *el*, *em*, *en*. *Praemium* is derived from *prae* and *emo* (in its earlier sense of *take*) and means 'the part of the booty taken out beforehand' as a reward for merit, then *reward* generally. *Deliciae* and *delicatus* point to *delicis* and †*delico*. Varro uses *delicis* to mean a young weaned pig. The word, if applied to lambs or kids, might easily mean *pet*, from which †*delico* with its participle *delicatus*; *deliciae* is then an abstract noun used, however, ordinarily as a concrete. *Provincia* is derived from *pro* and *vinco* through a †*provincus*. A consul engaged in extending the Roman dominion would be *provincus*, and his sphere of operations his *provincia*. From this meaning the others are developed.

On *Egregium Publicum* (Tac. Ann. III 70, 4), C. L. Smith. In the words "Capito insignitior fama fuit quod humani divinique iuris sciens egregium publicum et bonas artes dehonestavisset," Capito's eminence as a lawyer must be expressed as one of the objects of *dehonestavisset*. This relation is not contained in the words as they stand. For *egregium publicum* read *egregium publice locum*.

On the use of the Perfect Infinitive in Latin with the Force of the Present, A. A. Howard. "In early Latin the perfect infinitive with its proper significance was made to depend on the verb *nolo* or *uolo* in prohibitions; but since

the verb of wishing contained the idea of futurity, the whole clause acquired the force of a future perfect expression. Later writers, and especially the poets, transferred this use to negative clauses not prohibitive, containing verbs of wishing, and secondly to clauses containing verbs like *laboro*, *amo*, and *timeo*, 'Verba der Willensrichtung.' Since these verbs contain the idea of futurity, the present infinitive joined with them has the force of a future, the perfect infinitive the force of a future perfect. The tendency of the Latin writers to use the future perfect for the future, through an overstrained desire to be exact, led them in these clauses to use the perfect infinitive instead of the present. The poets, and especially the elegiac poets, took advantage of the opportunity thus offered and transferred the use to other constructions which did not contain a verb of wishing. The reasons for this were two: first, the present infinitive of a large number of verbs which they wished to use, could not, on account of metrical difficulties, be used in their verse, or could be used only under certain restrictions; second, the perfect infinitive of these verbs was peculiarly adapted to the necessities of the last half of pentameter verse. The infinitive in this use seemed to have the force of an aorist infinitive in Greek, and, in course of time, came to be used by the poets even where the metre admitted the use of the present infinitive."

Plutarch *περὶ εὐθουλίας*, H. N. Fowler. In this little treatise Plutarch does not, as R. Hirzel thinks, follow Panaetius for the most part, but derives his philosophical doctrines, as well as his anecdotes and quotations, chiefly from common-place books or anthologies, which he supplements by the results of his own reading.

Vitruviana, G. M. Richardson. The following peculiarities in Vitruvius' use of words are noticed: The limitative use of the preposition *ab* (I 1, 17); the descriptive use of *cum*, the preposition with its noun having the force of an adjective or adverb (I 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, III 1, 4); *aliter* repeated with *atque* as its connective (I 1, 7); *nec* strengthened by a following negative (I 1, 14); *oppido* followed by *quam* (I 3, 7, VII Praef. 14, VIII 3, 11, IX (2) 2); *quemadmodum* used as a relative to introduce a clause with or without a corresponding adverb, or to introduce an illustrative clause (in the sense "for example"), or to introduce a single word with the ellipsis of the verbal idea, and lastly *quemadmodum* as an interrogative (numerous examples); the repetition in the apodosis of the word which in the protasis forms the conditional particle (*sic*, *si*, I 2, 7); the use of *ut* in wishes, etc. (I 1, 3, VIII 7, 1); the indicative in indirect questions (II 6, 4, II 8, 18, II 9, 17, etc.); the infinitive as predicate after *esse* (II 9, 15); *putare*, in the sense of "intend" with complementary infinitive (II 1, 18).

The Social and Domestic Position of Women in Aristophanes, H. W. Haley. Women were held in low estimation both by men and by themselves. Perhaps the plays of Euripides helped to form this unfavorable estimate. Women were not the equals and confidants of their husbands. They were not allowed to appear in public, but were confined to the house, though married women had more liberty than the unmarried, and even the unmarried had considerable liberty in connection with religious festivals, marriage, and burial. Women appear to have been present at the performance of tragedies, but not of comedies. The chief domestic duties of women were the preparation of wool, spinning, weaving, etc. Cooking was usually done by slaves, and in wealthy

families the care of children was entrusted to slaves. Women learned the elements of letters, besides singing and dancing. For other information they depended upon conversation with their husbands and male relatives.

Notes. F. D. Allen. *ψαῖος*, attributed to Alcman in Schol. A, Iliad M 137, is miswritten for *φαῖος* = *φάος*. In CIL, I 199, *faenisiceī* is an error of the graver for *faenisicie*, the ablative of a † *faenisicies*, the counterpart of *faenisicia*. In Schol. Arist. Ran. 13, for *φορτικενομένου* read *φορτακενομένου*, and in Suidas s. v. *Δύκις* read *ἐφορτακεύετο* for *ἐφορτικεύετο*. In the Heracleian tables, I 105 flg. *ἀρτύω* is explained as referring to partnership, and translated 'make a compact' or 'go shares.' Aristophanes, Frogs 179 flg. are arranged in this order: 179, 181, 182, 183, 180, 184, the words in 181, *τοὐτὶ τί ἐστὶ*, being given to Dionysos, and *ὥπερ, παραβαλοῦ* (180) to Xanthias. In Herod. VI 57, the words *τρίτην δὲ τῇν ἐωντῶν* are regarded as an interpolation.—J. B. G. Martial V 78, v. 32 is explained as a question. The guest is asked who the fourth person at the banquet shall be.—G. M. L. *Ellum* is shown to be formed from *em illum*; cf. A. Spengel on Ter. Andria, 855.—A general index and an index of citations close the volume. H. N. F.

Gudrun, a Mediaeval Epic, translated from the Middle-High-German by Mary Pickering Nichols. Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1889. xv and 363 pp. Price \$2.50.

In the translation of a classical poem like Gudrun one of at least three methods may be pursued: (1) a literal prose rendering of the original, a "half-truth," may be given, with greatest success, perhaps, "in words that are old and plain," as in the case of the Butcher-Lang Odyssey, or the Lang-Leaf-Meyers Iliad; (2) the translator may reproduce the essential content and spirit, "fairly and honestly give the sense" in a more modern form of verse, as the Earl of Derby did in his Iliad, or Birch in his Nibelungenlied; (3) the essential content and spirit and also the original *verse-form* may be reproduced in a modern tongue, as in the case of Aubertin's Lusiads and Miss Nichols' Gudrun, the work under review. This last is certainly the ideal mode of rendering an ancient epic; for thus not only the flavor and color, but also the rhythmic effect of the original can be transmitted to the modern reader. Compare the following strophe (389) of the original, describing the effect of the Orphean strains of Horant's song, and the translation by Miss Nichols:

Diu tier in dem walde	ir weide liezen stên
die wûrme, die dâ solden	in dem grase gën
die vische, die dâ solden	in dem wâge vliezen,
die liezen ir geverte.	jâ kunde er sîner fuoge
	wol geniezen.

Translation :

The wild beasts in the forest	let their pasture grow ;
The little worms that creeping	through grass are wont to go,
The fishes, too, that ever	amidst the waves were swimming,
All now stopped to listen ;	the singer's heart with pride
	was overbrimming.